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#### Identities are commodified by their consumer profile— separating the individual from the market regenerates the autonomous Self, stabilizing the system and precluding radical change

Blühdorn ‘6[--(Ingolfur, associate Professor in Politics / Political Sociology @ the Department of European Studies @ the University of Bath](http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1368431006060461) , “Self-Experience in the Theme Park of Radical Action? Social Movements and Political Articulation in the Late-Modern Condition” pg. 34-37) kb

Contemporary social movements and new forms of political articulation are commonly interpreted along the same lines (e.g. Dierckxsens, 2000; Seel et al., 2000; Shutt, 2001; Waterman, 2001; Shepard and Hayduk, 2002; Crossley, 2003; George, 2004; Waters, 2004). Of course, many of them are first and foremost instrumental single-issue movements. But in particular anti-globalization move- ments, the new global justice protests or the new waves of direct action are widely described as radical counter-cultural movements. But even though many contem- porary social movements clearly are ‘fundamentally about challenging dominant cultural codes’ (Seel et al., 2000: 14) and about demonstrating that there is an alternative (Bennholdt-Thomson et al., 2001), their relationship to the estab- lished socio-economic system has undoubtedly changed. As the logic of the estab- lished system has permeated the very patterns of cognition and imagination of contemporary individuals, it is becoming increasingly difficult to even imagine a radically different society, let alone implement it. As late-modern individuals have fully embraced the patterns of identity construction offered by liberal consumer democracy, genuinely sustainable and globally just alternative models would, if really implemented, hardly be attractive or acceptable. It is probably safe to assume that despite their oppositional stance, even radical movement participants are in many respects rather fond of, and dependent on, the existing consumer culture. Indeed, in advanced modern societies, public support for the key prin- ciples of the established political and economic order is extremely high, while the level of enthusiasm for radical change is rather low. As the established system seems to have found strategies of pacifying concerns for the environment, gender equality, human rights or global justice – although the related problems are, obvi- ously, far from being resolved – there are no issues on the political horizon which might mobilize protests within advanced modern societies that could represent a genuine challenge to the established economic and political order. On the contrary, supposedly external challenges such as the proliferation of regional conflicts, economic crises, religious fundamentalism, organized crime and global terrorism provide the basis, across western(ized) societies, for an unprecedented consensus of system defence, whatever the cost entailed. Against this background, it seems appropriate to review the close connection that NSMT had made between identity politics and the idea of system transcend- ence (Blühdorn, 2006). Indeed, even Touraine, one of the founding fathers of NSMT, points out that while ‘in the past, social movements were the embodi- ment of a project for a radical reconstruction of society and a figure of the Subject’, contemporary protest movements have the ‘sole objective’ ‘to create the Subject’ (2000: 93), whereby the Subject is understood to mean ‘the individual’s effort to construct him or herself as an individual, rather than as a subordinate in a logic of order, whatever that order may be’ (1992: 141). Touraine is suggest- ing that a shift of emphasis has taken place from the dimension of political change to the dimension of identity construction. Contemporary society, he notes, ‘no more believes in political transcendence than it believes in religious transcend- ence’, and therefore, ‘the only societal movements that are possible today are movements that defend the personal Subject’ (2000: 93, my emphasis). Of course this does not imply the end of the mass of instrumental and goal-oriented single issue movements. But it implies that in the so-called counter-cultural movements the element of identity construction shifts to the centre, while the idea of system transcendence steps into the background. Furthermore, the subject and identity that contemporary social movements construct or defend are the personal rather than the collective subject. Without making any direct reference to Touraine – or indeed to any other social movement research – Patrick West, in a recent pamphlet published by the right-wing British think tank CIVITAS, voices some similar ideas. He suggests that, in contrast to the social movements of the late 1960s, contemporary social movements and forms of non-conventional political articulation have ‘little do to with changing the world’ (2004: 44), but are merely ‘symptoms of a cynical’ age (2004: 2). In post-modern society, West claims, ‘we no longer want to change the world; we want merely to be nice’. He describes contemporary post- conventional forms of collective political articulation as ‘conspicuous compassion’, ‘ostentatious caring’ (2004: 4) or ‘recreational grief ’ (2004: 11) which are essen- tially exercises of self-experience: ‘individuals project their ego onto society’ (2004: 23) in order to experience a ‘warm glow of self-satisfaction’ (2004: 37). West believes that the recent anti-war protests, anti-globalization movements and a range of other forms of non-conventional political articulation are almost exclusively ‘about feeling good, not doing good’ (2004: 1). West’s claims confirm the suggested shift of emphasis from political change to identity politics, but his analysis is unacceptable on at least three accounts. First, he ignores the large number of social movements which are clearly focused on very concrete and achievable small-scale reforms. Second, he fails to produce any empirical evidence for his comprehensive and generalizing claims. And, third, he undertakes no attempt to support his claims by any social-theoretical analysis of the societal conditions which might give rise to the phenomena he observes. Instead, West swiftly moves to making ideologically motivated assertions about the authenticity and moral integrity of contemporary social movements. Despite all this, however, he offers some relevant observations which deserve closer atten- tion. It is problematic to make claims, as West does, about the intentions and objectives of social movement participants which contradict their declared goals. It is not possible to provide evidence that activists do not genuinely aim for radical change, nor – as was hinted above – that they have, contrary to their own beliefs and self-descriptions, factually embraced the system which they claim to be opposing, and that they secretly endorse the consumption-oriented patterns of identity construction. From an actor-centred perspective, no claims of this kind can be sustained. From a social-theoretical perspective, however, and more specifically from a systems-centred perspective, the significance of the two elements in social movement politics, i.e. identity and transcendence, and their mutual relationship can indeed be reassessed. From this perspective it is possible – and for a more complex understanding of contemporary social movements and forms of political articulation very useful – to suggest that social movements are, irrespective of their own declared motivations and objectives, offering exactly what late-modern society urgently requires as a remedy for the dilemma of denu- cleated modernity. From this perspective, the significance of social movement politics lies not so much in the demonstration of protest and opposition for the purpose of political change, but in the demonstration, performance and experi- ence of something that is desperately needed in the late-modern condition but that has no place in the established socio-economic system: autonomy, identity, and agency. From this perspective, the centre of social movement activity is, thus, no longer the political alternative, but alterity, i.e. the desire of individuals to be different from the system and experience themselves as autonomous subjects. It was noted above that the late-modern dilemma consists in the fact that within the all-embracing system of the market there are no means and opportunities for constructing an autonomous subject and identity. The idea of autonomy demands distinction from and opposition to this system, yet the required tools and spaces do not exist. Social movements, however, offer exactly such a space. The individual and social identity which is performed or enacted within this space is indeed generated by means of distinction from, and opposition to, the system. Social movements and other kinds of non-conventional political articu- lation can thus be interpreted as offering a supplementary form of identity construction which helps to compensate for the shortcomings of consumption- centred identity formation. They provide late-modern individuals with an oppor- tunity to experience themselves both within (compliant with) and at the same time outside of (in opposition to, i.e. autonomous from) the system. Exactly this is required to escape the late-modern dilemma, and it is the unique characteristic and attractiveness of the theme park. In the sense that the demonstration of autonomy, identity and political agency inside the theme park of radical action allows for full complicity with the status quo outside this arena, it may be described as a post-political and itself consumptive form of political articulation. If it is correct to say, as suggested above, that the reproduction of the autonomous Self is not just a desire of late-modern individuals but a requirement for the self-reproduction of the increasingly one-dimensional system, social move- ments can thus be said to represent an essential resource for the stabilization of late-modern society. It would certainly be almost nonsensical to suggest that social movements explicitly intend to stabilize the established system. No empiri- cal research would ever support such a claim. On the contrary, it would reveal that social movements not only explicitly want to challenge the system, but that they are actually successful in doing so. The anti-war protests of 2003, GMO protests, anti-road movements, and so on provide plenty of evidence for this, even though none of these movements managed to achieve their respective radical goal. However, at a more profound level where the problem of self-referentiality is conceptualized as the central challenge to the established order, social move- ments do indeed have a system-stabilizing effect in that they reassert the autonomy and agency of the Self vis-à-vis the system. As a side effect of their politics of identity, social movements and non-conventional forms of political articulation are reconstituting what the political and economic systems need for their self-reproduction. They are regenerating the autonomous Self which is a vital resource for the stabilization of the system. Once again, this idea is not entirely new. In the 1980s Habermas (1981) described social movements as ‘early warning systems’ of the established order, and Luhmann (1995) saw them as a kind of societal ‘immune system’. Beck (1997), Luhmann (1989, 1996) and others believed that social movements stabilize functionally differentiated societies by increasing their reflexivity and compensating for their lack of a strate- gic centre (Blühdorn, 2005, 2006). And referring to societal reflexes against new waves of right-wing extremism, Rucht (2003a: 38) points out that ‘ex negativo, the protests of the radicals against the existing political and economic order thus serve the purpose to maintain this order’. Thus, the idea that the ‘unintended consequence of securing long-term stability of the political order may turn out to be the most important impact of today’s new social movements’ (Dalton and Kuechler, 1990: 298) has indeed often been rehearsed. Yet, in the late-modern condition, i.e. if seen against the background of the crisis of self-referentiality, the issue of system stabilization gains an entirely new quality and urgency. Within the framework of the outlined social theory, social movements can be seen as adopting the function of the performative reintroduction (Blühdorn, 2005) of the dualisms of traditional modernity. For the system of denucleated modernity, this reintroduction of the modernist dualism is vitally important. From the perspective of systemic self- reproduction, the internal simulation (Blühdorn, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006) of a supposedly external point of reference is fully sufficient; in fact, anything else would be undesirable – if only self-experience in the theme park of radical action can reproduce the belief in the autonomous subject.

#### Capitalism undergirds multiple forms of violence— class consciousness is necessary

LaBeouf ‘17--(Workshy, Leninist anti-imperialism @ Guevarista economics, “The Decaying Nature of Capitalism Poses Only Two Possible Futures: Socialism or Barbarism”, January 4th, 2017, <https://medium.com/@JoinedAtTheArse/the-decaying-nature-of-capitalism-poses-only-two-possible-futures-socialism-or-barbarism-b3a144432320>) kb

So far I have focused on the inevitable developments which are once again making socialism increasingly desirable and necessary. Of at least equal importance is a moral imperative that means it’s never a bad time to become a communist. That’s because, as with poverty and war, the capitalist mode of production is the primary source of racism, ableism and sexism (and by extension, homophobia and transphobia). We have already seen how imperialism impoverishes 100s of millions of people around the world (21,000 a day are starved to death) without a care for their religion, race, gender or sexuality. Racism inside the imperialist countries is primarily an extension of national oppression/neo-colonialism. When imperialist countries experience labour shortages at home, workers from the oppressed nations are ‘imported’ in larger numbers for cheap labour (thus constantly reproducing racism’s material basis by creating a ‘super-exploited’, ‘super-oppressed’ layer of the working class). The greatest example of this in Britain took place after WW2, when the country needed to be rebuilt as cheaply as possible. When there is more of a labour surplus, such as the present period, deportations increase and border controls tighten. For example, after the 1973 recession, deportations increased 11-fold over the next seven years. The overall number of people allowed to settle fell by 20% (by 42% in terms of people from the Commonwealth). Migrant workers, and women generally, tend to be the least well supported by the big trade unions, experience the worst jobs and living conditions, and are the easiest to throw out of employment and into the ‘reserve army of labour’ that capitalism needs to function (because unemployment holds down wages and ‘disciplines’ workers). The capitalist mode of production is the primary source of women’s oppression. Women have been oppressed in all class societies throughout history, and women’s oppression under capitalism takes a particular form in relation to how social production is organised — a dual oppression that compels women to reproduce the working class gratis at home (privatised labour), while also comprising part of a cheap reserve army of labour ready to serve capital as workers. This material basis for the oppression of women is fundamental and can only be changed by the overthrow of capitalism and its replacement by socialist relations of production, which will socialise house and care work, liberate the family from its status as an economic unit and therefore women from their status as solely instruments of production. Discrimination is primarily the expression of ideologies which in turn express class privilege, however they are dressed up, necessarily invented to justify economic and political exclusion. White supremacy was the invented justification for colonialism, for instance. This may sound crude or simplistic but stripping politics down to its foundations is what makes materialism so enlightening. Rather than making the argument that imperialist controls on the movement of oppressed people is racist, the best defence of immigration offered by social democrats tends to be that immigrants contribute more to the economy than vice-versa, reflecting the fact that the exploitation of cheap foreign labour contributes to the material basis of a labour aristocracy. Various racist ideologies are drummed into the population through ruling class media outlets in order to keep the masses divided among themselves instead of united against capital. While ‘intersectional feminism’ is an excellent tool for exposing unexamined prejudices and challenging state or societal discrimination, a materialist, class-based and anti-imperialist analysis is also needed to overcome its sometimes essentialising limitations. That sexism and racism are intrinsic to the capitalist system has been shown again by the necessity of austerity. As this LSE study states: “Austerity has had a greater adverse impact on women, especially ethnic minority and low-income families, who have born 78.9 per cent of the welfare cuts in the 2015 government budget.” Likewise, disabled people have suffered greatly from austerity. By the Department for Work and Pensions’ own admission, 90 people per month are dying after being told they are fit for work. Capital is happy to see the end of an abundant supply of labour die off — disabled people have been savagely targeted because they are the most vulnerable and least ‘productive’ for capital. In fact, it is society under capitalism which disables people through structures of exclusion, and by literally limiting the accessibility of public spaces and services. In Britain, half of the people living in poverty either live with a disabled person or are themselves disabled. What’s more, the above factors combined with the alienating effects of capitalist society — where individualism is sacred and collectivism belittled, where stress is normalised and rest is mocked — degrades mental wellbeing on a widespread scale. This is exacerbated by the fact that social and mental health care services under capitalism are woefully inadequate. None of this is to say that racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia and ableism will disappear the night after a revolution, but to argue that the economic foundations that constantly reproduce these forms of oppression will be dismantled during the process of building socialism.

#### The alternative is socialism from below—recognizing historical materialism and using it as a building block for socialist party politics creates for hope for the proletariat.

Selfa ‘16--(Lance, a frequent contributor to the ISR, and writes a column on U.S. politics in Socialist Worker newspaper, “Socialism in the Air”, Summer 2016, Issue #101, <http://isreview.org/issue/101/socialism-air>) kb

In Two Souls, Draper reviews and critiques the main theories of socialism from above—utopianism, elitist anarchism, social democracy and Stalinism. While the exact historical references may not be current, the trends of social thought he challenges are still with us. Ideas of utopianism permeated the Occupy encampments of 2011. “Anarcho-liberalism” remains a key influence among newly radicalizing people. And Sanders’s own version of socialism is derived from the socialism from above of European social democracy. The argument here isn’t that “the more things change, the more they stay the same.” As Draper pointed out, when people reject capitalism, they often gravitate to one or another version of socialism from above that is on offer. It often seems easier and more natural for people to place their hopes in a savior from above. But only socialism from below offers the prospect of a transformation that would place ordinary people in charge of the economy and society. As Draper put it in his conclusion, How does a people or a class become fit to rule in their own name? Only by fighting to do so. Only by waging their struggle against oppression—oppression by those who tell them they are unfit to govern. Only by fighting for democratic power do they educate themselves and raise themselves up to the level of being able to wield that power. There has never been any other way for any class. . . . In the last analysis, the only way of proving [theories of “socialism from above”] false is in the struggle itself. That struggle from below has never been stopped by the theories from above, and it has changed the world time and again. To choose any of the forms of Socialism-from-Above is to look back to the old world, to the “old crap.” To choose the road of Socialism-from-Below is to affirm the beginning of a new world. Today, we’re at the beginning of this conversation. Millions of people today may express favorable opinions of socialism. But what they mean by socialism requires a lot of unpacking. And winning them to a conception of socialism from below, an idea that animates this journal, is a challenge for socialists today. Discovering what socialism really is. At the turn of the last century, the German socialist Werner Sombart asked, in the title of his book, Why Is There No Socialism in the United States? He answered the question with a famous quip: “On the reefs of roast beef and apple pie socialistic utopias of every sort are sent to their doom.”13 Today, more and more people are having trouble affording roast beef and apple pie. So when socialists today say the United States is a class society, most people agree with us. The collapse of Stalinism has made it easier to talk about what socialism really is. When it’s explained to people—a world where the means of production and distribution are collectively and democratically controlled; where everyone has a job, food, and housing; where racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression are abolished and where there are no wars—it sounds pretty reasonable. But if a substantial section of a new generation is open to the ideas of socialism, the question of organization—whether we need one, and what forms it can take—poses many challenges and, of course, many opportunities. The starting point is to build organizations of socialists that commit to creating a political alternative independent of the two main capitalist parties and their subsidiaries. Karl Marx’s greatest contributions were always made in the course of the class struggle, while attempting to organize it and to influence it. As Marx said many times, he was not the first socialist. But he was the first to organize a political movement under the slogan “the emancipation of the working class is the act of the working class.” In the Communist Manifesto, Marx and his lifelong collaborator Frederick Engels explained why socialists need to be organized: The Communists, therefore, are on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working-class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement. Put in more modern terms, the most committed socialist fighters and activists need to come together in an organization because collectively they can influence the wider movement. And an organization of comrades committed to changing the world—and debating, discussing, and organizing how best to do that—is the key to “clearly understanding” what the movement needs to win its aims. In the United States, part of the clear understanding involves recognition that the Democratic Party must be soundly rejected as any sort of vehicle for fundamental social change. Today, there is an international ruling-class consensus that says we must live through a “decade of austerity” to overcome the imbalances of the period that blew up in 2008. But we need to ask ourselves: is that the future we want for ourselves or our children? Do we want a state of permanent war lasting for decades? Do we want a world where the United States spends more on weapons than the rest of the world combined—while two billion people live on less than one dollar a day? Movements like Occupy and Black Lives Matter show that there is a growing group of young activists who are deciding for themselves what they will do in the face of these questions. They are looking not only for ideas to change the world, but also for organizations to embody that alternative. Socialists today need to think the same way: how we can build from the struggles of today the kind of political alternative that we need to the current system. As British socialist Duncan Hallas wrote in a seminal contribution on socialist organization, reprinted in ISR 100,15. That alternative must be more than a mere collection of individuals giving general adherence to a platform. It must also be a center for mutual training and debate, for raising the level of the raw activist to that of the experienced, for the fusion of the experiences and outlook of manual and white collar workers and intellectuals with ideas of scientific socialism. It must be a substitute for those institutions, special schools, universities, clubs, messes and so on, through which the ruling class imbues its cadres with a common outlook, tradition and loyalty. And it must do this without cutting off its militants from their fellow workers. Transforming a new generation of socialists from isolated or individual militants into an organized, and conscious, force will be a key task in years to come.

#### The ROB is to vote for the debater that best engages in socialist party politics. Only a denucleated modernity provides a new framework for structural change in social movements subsumes their framing because it’s a pre-req to solving for issues for identities.

Blühdorn ‘6[--(Ingolfur, associate Professor in Politics / Political Sociology @ the Department of European Studies @ the University of Bath](http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1368431006060461) , “Self-Experience in the Theme Park of Radical Action? Social Movements and Political Articulation in the Late-Modern Condition” pg. 33) kb

Analysis of the late-modern condition and the dilemma of denucleated modernity provides a new framework for the interpretation of contemporary social movements and non-conventional political articulation. Of course, these forms of political participation cannot unproblematically be described as direct responses to the outlined crises of self-referentiality. Indeed, attempts to explain social movements as the response to structural strains and systemic crises have always been confronted with difficulties to explain the connection between systems and actors. Systems cannot be assumed to have either the cognitive capacities to become aware of their crises, or the agency to take co-ordinated remedial action. Actors, on the other hand, cannot easily be assumed to respond to abstract systemic crises, but their mobilization and action will require some kind of personal grievances as motivational foundation. In fact, even the link between personal grievances and political mobilization is rather uncertain. Structural strains approaches have been criticized not only because they undermine the rationality of social movements, shifting them closer towards irrational, passionate or emotional eruptions, but also because they cannot explain why only in rare cases personal grievances really translate into mobilization and political action, especially into collective action. It was not least for these reasons that social movement research turned from structural strain and grievances approaches to resource mobilization theories and the investigation of political opportunity structures (e.g. Laraña et al., 1995; Crossley, 2002). It therefore seems difficult to interpret contemporary social movements and new forms of political articulation as directly responding to the systemic problems which have been outlined above. But it has been suggested above that the condition of late-modern society, i.e. its systemic crisis of self-referentiality, can be alleviated through the reconstruction of the autonomous subject and identity. And while social movements cannot easily be regarded as responding to systemic crises, they can indeed be interpreted as centring on the reconstruction of the autonomous self. As a matter of fact, exactly this has always been seen as a key dimension of social movement activity. Taking account of the fact that social movements are much more than campaigns for specific political goals, Rucht (1990) and others have suggested a distinction between goal-oriented, instrumental dimensions in social movement activity and more identity-oriented, expressive ones. Already in the early 1980s Habermas (1981) noted that the sub- cultural and counter-cultural new social movements of that time no longer sought to capture the state, i.e. political control, but were increasingly concerned with identity politics and conflicts over lifeworld issues. Giddens’s (1991) concept of life politics and Beck’s (1992) notion of sub-politics point in a similar direction.

### 2

#### Interpretation: ****The aff may only garner offense from the hypothetical implementation of the resolution****

**Violation: they don’t – CX proves**

#### Net benefits –

**1. Procedural fairness – even if this specific method is debatable – the way it frames the rez makes it nearly impossible to negate.**

**A) I can’t go for any disad, specific CPs, solvency turns, etc in order to answer the aff, you’ll just delink my offense in the 1ar by claiming implementation is irrelevant – which could also apply to any generic I’d read to compensate that assumes the aff takes a tangible action. Kills neg ground since certain principles are good in the abstract; it only makes sense taking everything into context. Ground is key to fairness since equal access to arguments controls equal access to the ballot.**

#### B) Limits: their model has no resolutional bound and creates the possibility for literally an infinite number of 1ACs. Not debating the topic allows someone to specialize in one area of the library for 4 years giving them a huge edge over people who switch research focus ever 2 months, which means their arguments are presumptively false because they haven’t been subject to well-researched scrutiny. Cutting negs to every possible aff wrecks small schools, which has a disparate impact on under-resourced and minority debaters. Counter-interpretations are arbitrary, unpredictable, and don’t solve the world of neg prep because there’s no grounding in the resolution.

#### Procedural fairness outweighs –

**A) The best solutions are formed with critical contestation from multiple sides – it’s more likely we make a good liberation strategy if both debaters can engage and test it.**

#### B) Inescapable – every argument you make concedes the authority of fairness: i.e. that the judge will evaluate your arguments. Absent some judge-debater reciprocal relationship, they could just hack against or for you. Means that there is always some implicit policing in debate and the impact turns are terminally non-unique. Also proves that if they win fairness doesn’t matter you should vote neg on presumption because you have no reason to not just hack for me.

#### C) Tangibility – voting aff has no terminal impact- it doesn’t educate anyone or cause us to make some societal shift whereas theory norms are set all the time like nibs and brackets. The judge isn’t really voting for anything when they affirm: you can’t set a norm with this aff.

#### They don’t get to weigh case against T

#### A) Evaluation – even if their arguments seem true, that’s only because they already had an advantage – fairness is a meta constraint on your ability to determine who best meets their ROB. If one debater had ten minutes to speak and the other had three there would be incongruence that alters ability to judge the *truth value* of who wins on the AC so cross-applications don’t work. Which means don’t weigh the case against T since I couldn’t disprove the case isnce it was non-t.

**TVA – Read an aff that talks about banning IPP and the impacts it has on women in the medical space and their access to medicine**

**Competing Interpretations**

**Reasonability causes a race to the bottom because debaters keep being barely reasonable**

**Drop the debater:**

**Dropping them and their advocacy are functionally the same.**

**No RVI’s**

**1. Real world applicability- proving that you’re being fair doesn’t mean you get voted up.**

### 3

#### Counter method – **join. W.in debate**

#### Long term solvency

#### Coalition building

### Case

#### Their model requires that I argue for patriarchy we aren’t saying to table the discussion but discus it in different aspects f\of the debate space

#### TVA is not about silencing but the UQ topic edu that we lose from disenganign with the topic Discussions of women’s access to medicine or how queer folk have access to hormones are examples

#### They say defending topic props up existing weapons but the card is 1. Not about debate and 2. Not about IPP